

Sept. 7, 2014 (#1459)
"Cutting Through the Matrix" with Alan Watt
(Blurb, i.e. Educational Talk)

**"You Know There's Something Wicked Under the Hood
Yet Like Circus Seals You Applaud "Change is Good""**

© Alan Watt Sept. 7, 2014

Title & Dialogue Copyrighted Alan Watt - Sept. 7, 2014 (Exempting Music and
Literary Quotes)

cuttingthroughthematrix.com

alternate sites:

cuttingthroughthematrix.net , .us , .ca

alanwattcuttingthroughthematrix.ca

European site includes all audios & downloadable TRANSCRIPTS in European
languages for print up:

alanwattsentientsentinel.eu

mirror site:

cuttingthrough.jenknness.com

**Information for purchasing Alan's books, CDs, DVDs and
DONATIONS:**

Canada and America: PayPal, Cash, personal checks &
for the US, **INTERNATIONAL** postal money orders / for Canada, INTERNAL postal
money orders

(America: Postal Money orders - Stress the **INTERNATIONAL** pink one, not the green
internal one.)

Outside the Americas: PayPal, Cash, Western Union and Money Gram
(Money Gram is cheaper; even cheaper is a Money Gram check - in Canadian dollars:
mail via the postal services worldwide.)

PayPal Orders: USE THE [DONATE](#) BUTTON ON THE WEBSITE - AND -
Send a separate email along with the donation (list your order, name and address)

Click the link below for your location (ordering info):

[USA](#)

[Canada](#)

[Europe/Scandinavian](#)

[All Other Countries](#)

Hi folks, I'm Alan Watt and this is Cutting Through The Matrix on September the 7th, 2014. It's amazing how, when it comes to giving a blurb, a thousand things will happen that day, none pleasant mind you. You have to go out and deal with them, like fixing old junk vehicles and that kind of thing. That's what I do at least. It's amazing what comes along here and the things you have to cope with. Because we're dealing really with, not just junk that's sold to us, even when it's brand-new junk, but old junk as well, at least I am. Because everybody's idea of poverty is rather relative isn't it? Some people who can't build their third house would say that they're in poverty. Other folk are hunting for jobs, or even working at some job, but they also have the same idea, and this is from emails I get too from a lot of people who are genuine in their circumstances. But it's amazing to see how they judge poverty because they all have their latest cell phones and all the latest apps and all the rest of it, and all the things that people seem to think that they must have today. I don't have a cell phone. I don't have TV either for that matter, or

cable or anything else. All I have, and I wouldn't have that if it wasn't necessary, is the satellite and so on for what I'm doing here in talking to you. I wouldn't even be touching a computer in fact because it's not a help, it's a hindrance. It's a virtual reality designed to alter you and keep you occupied endlessly, by other people's ideas of what *you* should believe or think, or have as what you think is entertainment but in actual fact there's always propaganda embedded all through it in fact.

It's amazing to me how the people who gobble up all these cop movies, and now it's all terrorist movies, internal terrorist movies, and they gobble it up and always give you the good-looking young guy who's got a wee bit of a chip on his shoulder, and he's tough as nails of course. But they like that because that's a stereotype which turn on the young females. They used the same technique from James Dean onwards for the singers, the pouting thing, you know, the kind of angry little young guy look. But somehow that appeals to especially young women, and maybe a lot of older ones as well. The bad boy, you see, they like bad boys. And of course with all these terrorist movies it's the same thing, the guy who's got a chip on his shoulder and they're always ready to fire him. It's always *the one*, he's the only *the one* for the job, you see, when the crisis comes along and he has to deal with it. That's how they're all made. It's a standard formula in stacks of movies you see.

And if you believed in the movies, which most folk do unfortunately today, then their idea of the world around them is very, very scary. Because that which turns them on, the excitement, is meant to also put them in a state of almost sheer panic, but also to make you subservient to the SWAT teams and the militarization of the police. That's what I'm going to touch on tonight, because I had no idea what to talk about tonight because I really have been fixing a junker vehicle, even all through the night and most of the day as well.

But here's really a story that most people are neglecting altogether. They go into the causes. Some of them hardly even touch on the social problems, especially in the US, but now in Britain and elsewhere too, through mass immigration and the crime that came in with it too. I can remember many, many years ago for instance in Britain, many years ago there were big howls and protests at the time from the fake Labour Party, which was really almost communist, actually it was communist, many of the top party members were and that got exposed many years later of course. But they were card-carrying members of the Communist Party, who were sworn to overthrow the Western systems, completely. Which always made me wonder how on earth they could possibly not ban it in the first place, ban communism, simply straight out ban it. But they didn't, did they, which made me start to think that there's got to be something else going on here with communism. Because, why wouldn't they ban something that was going to destroy your whole way of life, even if it wasn't really designed by you in the first place, it's always by the dominant minority, in every country, in every system, that owns the system? So why wouldn't they ban it?

Of course once I got into the reading, very early on, as to why the Soviet system got up and running in the first place, and then you find out that many of them who led, and became generals and so on in the Soviet Union, for the rebellion, for the actual Bolshevik rebellion, were trained *inside the US* and funded by big bankers, like Bernard Baruch and Schiff and a whole bunch of them were involved in the financing of the revolution to get it all going, and planning it and training the guys,

in terrorist activities actually, to overthrow the existing system. No matter what your opinions happen to be on the existing system, the fact is, the Western countries, the banking system that runs all of us, financed a system that was essentially terrorist. And this terrorist organization killed *many millions*, right up until its end. There's many movies out now, more documentary ones I should say, to do with, for instance, the Stasi system when Eastern Germany was totally taken over by the Soviet system at the end of World War II. The Stasi system was really a totalitarian system. Everyone was terrified of the Stasi. They were experts at bugging folk's apartments, rooms, everything. All you had to do was to give an opinion on something that wasn't quite kosher and away, you were just *disappeared*, very, very simply and quickly dealt with.

And yet here we are living through, since 9/11, this whole antiterrorism nonsense in the whole West. It shouldn't have happened in the first place because after all, when you think about it, the Middle East was pretty stable, from the citizenry of the West's point of view, for an awful long time, regardless of who the West had put in power there, Saddam Hussein and these guys, but he kept the place stable. These cities that were first world cities and the whole thing are all lying in rubble today. Of course in Libya too, we know what happened in Libya. They demolished their infrastructure, the West went in, just like they did in Iraq, and plundered it for its oil, its water and its resources. And they're putting pipelines across desert in different countries, as we speak, and they have been from the beginning of the war.

So we're living through long-term agendas. I've gone through all of that stuff, the long-term agendas from New American Century Project and the group involved in it. And it's still going on today under Obama, beginning with Bush Jr and going on under Obama. But even then, long before that, before they had the trouble, the conflict with Iraq, before he invaded Kuwait, the big massive oilfields that were owned by the Western boys who set it up in the first place... In fact, Bush Junior, I think Senior too, were instrumental in that. Bush got his start, his training in how the world really works as he was appointed to look after that for a while. They always put them into oil systems, like Maurice Strong, same thing, the big UN guy, globalist, who was picked up by Rockefeller when Strong was young and groomed for his position as the environmentalist and all the other things he's planning. He really is a clone of George Bernard Shaw, the top socialist of the Fabian Society, and HG Wells too. Because they laid upon the whole socialist agenda on the line, how experts would rule, the intelligentsia of the experts would rule us all, logically supposedly, according to them, and decide how much of a population they wanted, who would live and who would die, and you had to have a good reason why they would *allow* you to live. There would be no unemployment because they'd either put you in jail or execute you, very, very simple, if they couldn't retrain you. And they all gave the same pattern of dialogue and so on in their books.

But as I say, Kuwait, I can remember before the invasion of Kuwait by Hussein, he had been complaining *vehemently* to the United Nations and to the West of these Americanized companies in Kuwait that were doing horizontal drilling, they called it, for oil. I think it was even in some of the science magazines, maybe even Popular Mechanics or something, where they showed you how these oil rigs could actually drill down and then do a horizontal turn and go underneath the ground, into neighboring countries, and suck out their oil. And Kuwait was guilty of that. It was discussed by Hussein at the time to the British and the American diplomats

who said IT WAS NONE OF THEIR AFFAIR, and that's why he went and invaded them. But of course they wanted him to invade so that they could get an excuse for the war, which lasted all through really Gulf War One into the next invasion of actual Iraq itself. But it's still going on today as all these countries on the tick list of the New American Century group are being taken out. They're not finished yet, by the way.

Because a lot of things are accomplished in war. Remember, Carroll Quigley said, WE GET MORE DONE IN FIVE YEARS OF WAR, he meant on the total socialist expert-driven agenda, THAN IN 50 YEARS OF PERSUASION AND PROPAGANDA. And sure enough, that's what happens. That's why they're on a roll today for the 21st century, and brought it in for the 21st century. All these agendas have to be fulfilled, until the lifestyle you're left with at the end of the century will have no resemblance at all to what went before. And there's many, many sides to all of this, all participating in this big agenda, the Millennium Project and all the rest of it, Agenda 21, etc.

I heard one far con man, a supposed lefty, environmentalist, who's funded and got a great salary by the big foundations, just the other night in fact, on a late-night radio talk, going through his usual lies about promoting the biofuels and all they have to do is program the existing cars' computers in a certain fashion to allow it to use this biofuel, which is very high in the content of, really, an alcohol-based fuel, basically alcohol fuel. They call it ethyl-ol, ethylol, which is an ethyl alcohol basically. This stuff runs so hot that the American manufacturers of autos just recently had to admit it's burning out the engines much, much faster. The small engines manufacturers across the world have been complaining for years about it, as they keep adding it according to UN treaty. The percentage is going up all the time in your regular gasoline, and apart from giving you a lot less miles to the gallon, and being heavily subsidized too, by your tax money by the way as government throws it at these projects, that's how they make it at the moment *reasonable*, as they call it; once they have them all running on this stuff, then they'll take all the subsidies off, as you well know. But this stuff literally burns the pistons, the aluminum pistons *in* the engines. If you take a new engine apart after using it for maybe two or three weeks you'll find it's got all these pitting bits in it where it's literally... it just takes little pings off it and chunks off it and you think it's been through about 60 years of use. Of course what they'll tell you is some of these cars, which are designed to take both fuels, or higher percentages, oh, you can put titanium particles in and various other particles in to strengthen them, etc. But as I say, it runs so hot that the engine simply can't cope with it, it will burn them out much, much faster. You get less miles to the gallon. And what you also get is a lot more water in your gasoline because it attracts water, being almost a pure alcohol material basically, it attracts very heavily water particles, and they rust out your tank and everything else, and your lines much quicker. These are the things they don't want to talk about, about it.

I'm not saying that there shouldn't be other ways for better fuels and so on. I'm sure at the very high tech side of things they've got things which can work on very little, of whatever, at a reasonable cost, but it's not intended that you have anything like that in your lifetimes, and I mean lifetimes, like I'm talking about generations, because you've always been run by those in control. And believe you me, this ethanol racket is another con game being played upon the people. Because they don't want you driving eventually *at all*, except those, under Agenda

21 it states quite plainly, THAT HAVE ESSENTIAL VEHICLES *ONLY*. Essential being: the law, civil servants, bureaucrats, police, ambulances, etc., etc. Because it actually says in the Agenda 21 program, that you'll have NO PRIVATE VEHICLES. Remember, this is the 21st century we're in, folks. All this has to be accomplished in your lifetime.

But what did come across, quite interestingly enough in that talk, the pure propaganda talk that was on last night, what came across was also, through all the lies this guy was putting out there, deliberate too, definitely. What came across to me was how happy they are that fewer folk are driving. And he called himself also, *a millennialist*. And the hostess, who was part of the con game, said, *what is that?* Well, it's the generation born from 1980 onwards. Then she chipped in, the host, and she says, *oh they've had less brainwashing, that's why they're all for this*. Rather than say, *no*, well actually they've had *more* brainwashing obviously to be all *for* this, *to save the planet*.

We're all used like stupid guinea pigs, I mean *stupid* ones. Because guinea pigs and rats and so on are anything but stupid. We're stupider because we can only be fooled by words and pictures, symbology in other words. A picture is a symbol, moving pictures are simply symbols too, all strung together and you can show horror stories and terrify youngsters at school to make them go along with any agenda that you want. It's quite simple. Then the constant propaganda barrage through regular media will eventually alter their minds, they're already persuaded and they already have their default position set in them when these topics come up. Every generation has had its own brainwashing, remember, and it's unceasing. Always grab the youth first, work on them heavily, and they're yours, they're yours for life basically, they won't change their opinions really. It's quite interesting.

I listened to another radio guest, not last night, the night before I think it was or the night before that. He talked about the studies into people's ideologies. He never touched on how they *got to* their ideologies, what programmed them to come to these things, but he did go through the usual thing. Because they're always doing studies to see how, again, to see how different generations have different opinions. Because what they're really doing through all these studies is to find out if the really heavy indoctrination to a generation born, say, in the 1980s and the 90s and so on are vastly different, *if their propaganda is working or not*. That's really why they do these incredibly detailed ongoing studies. And it is working, unfortunately. It is working. That's why you can't talk to, say, younger folk on different things, they've already had their Pavlovian training, and the topics come up, if they hear anything negative they switch off, walk away and they get reset to their default position, like a computer. And that's what they call it, by the way, in neuroscience, is DEFAULT POSITIONS FOR HUMANS.

Now, on another topic, getting back to what I said at the beginning, how we've got militarization through all of society since 9/11, so many things that are so important. See, the details of the incidences, that go on *every day*, are really unimportant. It's *collectively* that they're important. Because you have to see what's behind them, not the things that happen or how they're portrayed as been happening, but collectively what is this group of things *pointing to*, what is the point and purpose of it and so on? I've looked at the US a lot because they've had fairly unique problems for a long time, understood by many, mind you, as to why they've had various problems. You've had different groups in the US there, some

who were marginalized at one point, other ones who came in to run the Communist Party for the US, who tried to get other groups, minority groups to lead revolutions; in other words, he used for revolutions, to get another agenda through. But it's always one group using another, you see. And many of the leaders of minority groups eventually caught on to that, as to actually who was running them. It's quite an interesting story in itself and that would take forever to go through the history of it.

But this particular book was sent to me... And remember, I don't get money for plugging anybody's books, and I've never met the author or talked to the author or written to the author. But it's a book which is well worth getting a hold of. It's called **Rise of the Warrior Cop: The Militarization of America's Police Forces**. Because this pertains not just to the US but to Britain, although it's mainly the US, what's happened in the US, you can see its mirror image happening in Britain and other parts of Europe today. And the book was by Radley Balko, his name is. As I say, I get nothing for mentioning it. But the fact is, he certainly did his homework in getting the history of the US, going way back to its founding, and how the Constitution constantly got changed and changed and changed, and amendments and so on. And I've often meant to talk about that because I've noticed the different houses of Congress coming in with the agendas on the table and they had to change the Constitution. How they do it is by *reinterpreting* the Constitution, or the part that they want to put forward. So they bring in the batteries of lawyers who go through it in an almost Talmudic style and find out, *well this word could also mean that and this phrase could also mean that*, and no matter how they stretch it they'll get what they want, you see. And that's their job, that's what they do.

But this particular book says in the cover, it actually says in the cover...

The last days of colonialism taught America's revolutionaries that soldiers in our streets bring conflict and tyranny. As a result, our country has generally worked to keep the military out of law enforcement. But according to investigative reporter Radley Balko, over the last several decades, America's cops have increasingly come to resemble ground troops. The consequences have been dire: the home is no longer a place of sanctuary, the Fourth Amendment has been gutted, and police today have been conditioned to see the citizens they serve as an other (*Alan: ...and then it says...*)—an enemy.

Today's armored-up policemen are a far cry from the constables of early America. The unrest of the 1960s (*A: ...and there's so much to do with that that isn't touched on in the book, as to why the unrest in the 60s was going on, really, and that's the story of those who were trying to get the minority groups to start revolutions, and use them. Anyway it says here that it...*) brought about the invention of the SWAT unit—which in turn led to the debut of military tactics in the ranks of police officers. Nixon's War on Drugs, Reagan's War on Poverty, Clinton's COPS program, the post-9/11 security state under Bush and Obama: by degrees, each of these innovations expanded and empowered police forces, always at the expense of civil liberties. And these are just four among a slew of reckless programs.

In **Rise of the Warrior Cop**, Balko shows how politicians' ill-considered policies and relentless declarations of war against vague enemies like crime,

drugs, and terror have blurred the distinction between cop and soldier. His fascinating, frightening narrative shows how over a generation, a creeping battlefield mentality has isolated and alienated American police officers and put them on a collision course with the values of a free society.

Just to review a little of the book I'll mention that on page 206, **Rise of the Warrior Cop**, he says...

In 1989 a friend asked Peter Kraska if he wanted to tag along for a US Coast Guard exercise on Lake Erie. Kraska is a criminologist at the University of Eastern Kentucky. His students described him as demanding, whip smart, and in the words of one female student, "a strangely hot lumberjack". He agreed to go along mostly out of curiosity. While on the trip Kraska learned that the Coast Guard worked closely with the U.S. Navy on drug interdiction efforts. The Navy itself would intercept boats or ships that fit drug courier profiles but would then have Coast Guard personnel on board to conduct the actual searches, seizures and arrests. One Coast Guard officer flatly admitted to Kraska, "the procedure was a way of getting around the Navy's policy prohibiting its personnel from participating in civil police actions."

Kraska was both alarmed and intrigued. The experience started him down a road of scholarship focused on examining the ways in which the US military was increasingly being drawn into enforcing drug laws. In particular, Kraska began looking into indirect militarization, the rise of SWAT teams and other paramilitary police teams, what might be called the criminal justice industrial complex (*A: And that's a big one because in this book he goes through the amount of money that's been spent, by your tax money actually, to buy all the used equipment, and much of it too, this used equipment, heavy artillery and various other things, is not that really old.*) and the increasing intensity to public officials to address social problems (*A: ...very important.*) with martial, military in other words, rhetoric and imagery to suggest that military-like solutions, from the wars on crime and drugs, to the heavy weaponry and vehicles that police were beginning to use, to the proposals that juvenile offenders be punished in boot camps. (*A: I remember in the 80s actually, in all Western countries, that suddenly became popular to get young offenders into these militarized boot camps run by ex-military personnel.*)

Kraska obtained funding to conduct two broad surveys of police departments and their use of SWAT teams. His resulting report systematically documented a previously unheeded two-decade insurgence of militarism into just about every city and county in America. The numbers were staggering. By 1995 89% of American cities with 50,000 or more people had at least one SWAT team, double the percentage from 1980. Among smaller cities, population between 25,000 and 50,000, 65% had a SWAT team, by 1995 a 157% increase over 10 years, nearly 20% of all police officers in these towns served on the SWAT team. A phenomenon that Kraska dubbed the Militarization of Mayberry. By 1995 combining these figures for cities and towns, 77% of all American cities with over 25,000 people had a SWAT team.

Kraska then asked police departments that had maintained SWAT teams going back to the early 1980s to report how many times the teams had been deployed over the years and for what reasons. Again, the numbers were jaw-

dropping. In the early 1980s the aggregate number of annual SWAT deployments was just under 3000. (A: *...that's them being sent out.*) By 1995 it was just under 30,000 (A: *...from 3000 to 30,000...*) deployments. In 15 years the numbers of annual SWAT team deployments in America had jumped by 937%. Some SWAT teams, Kraska found, were conducting up to 700 raids per year. What was precipitating the insurgence of SWAT activity? The drug war almost exclusively. (A: *That's the answer that they were always giving.*)

Logan, Utah, is a typical example of the phenomenon. As of 2011 the city had just under 50,000 people. It had not had a murder in five years and had been recently rated the safest city in America. And yet since the mid-1980s Logan has had its own SWAT team. (A: *It goes on to ask...*) What does a SWAT team do in a city with no violent crime? It creates violence out of nonviolent crime.

(A: *And this is a quote, it says...*)

"We haven't really had a whole lot of barricaded subjects and certainly we haven't had an active gunman shooter" the department spokesman told the local paper, "but it was nice to have the SWAT team around just in case. In the meantime, it's mostly used for assistance on high risk search warrants, high risk meaning all or most drug warrants. We've destroyed some doors over the years that maybe wouldn't have gotten destroyed if there wasn't a SWAT team, but that's all in the name of trying to make a high risk situation more safe for everyone."

Some 43% of the police departments in Kraska's survey told him they had used active duty military personnel (A: *...active duty personnel, military.*) to train the SWAT teams when it first started and 46% were training on a regular basis with active duty military experts in special operations, usually the Army Rangers or the Navy SEALs. This was the goal of the joint task forces set up during the Bush administration to encourage cooperation between local police, federal police and the military in order to foster a battlefield approach to drug enforcement.

In a follow-up interview one department SWAT commander told Kraska, "We've had special forces folks who've come right out of the jungles of Central and South America, these guys get into the real shit. All branches of military service are involved in providing training to law enforcement. (A: *ALL branches of military...*) US Marshals that act as liaisons between police and military to set up the training, are go-betweens. We've had teams of Navy SEALs and Army Rangers come here and teach us everything. We just have to use our judgment and exclude the information, like, at this point we bring in the mortars and blow the place up." (A: *They exclude that kind of information to the press, you see.*)

And by the way, this is quite an amazing book because they go through the fact that they actually do have the mortars, mortar bombs for God's sake, which you use on battlefields, and much, much, much, much more of course. This is a fantastic book because it goes into the history, as I say, of the chipping away of rights over centuries. They talk about the Castle Doctrine that came from England; it was held up for an awful long time. The Castle doctrine was that MAN'S HOME IS HIS CASTLE, it didn't matter how humble it was, and how for

centuries even the local sheriff, if they had lots of information to even *go up and knock on that door* to serve any kind of warrant, and they had to knock first and produce the evidence, and they had to give, by the way, the person, the resident *time to get to that door, plenty of time*, and open that door for them; they didn't come in and just use a battering ram automatically. And they had to show the evidence, tell them that and all the rest of it and go through the procedure, and how they whittled that down. But the US had the same doctrine.

It's interesting, and I've mentioned the Rockefellers so many times, Nelson Rockefeller and others, who were really pushing for all this system back in the 60s to be brought into the US, of militarization, and the war on drugs especially, and he wanted the no-knock law that would do away with the Castle Doctrine. He put a bill forward and they followed that, in I think New York State initially, other ones copied it until it became just normal. They simply come up with a battering ram and smash through and go through the windows and everything, like the military does, you see. And this book is very, very precise. Lots of quotations. Lots of information from the military too, cooperating with the police, constantly, how they're brought in as advisors, supposedly, when they supply them with special battlefield equipment for a particular task. That's what they do abroad when they say that *the US has sent advisors over*. Technically they're not supposedly involved in the killing and shooting but you know they're right on the battlefield, they're doing it too, of course they are.

Now getting back to this book here and continuing from that last quote...

The commander added that he had "received a letter from a four-star general expressing concern about this sort of training the department was getting."

Back in the 1850s the Cushing Doctrine had allowed federal marshals to summon US troops to enforce domestic law. More than 100 years after the controversial policy, which was repealed by the Posse Comitatus Act, federal marshals were now soliciting elite US military personnel again, not to enforce domestic law themselves but to teach civilian police officers how to enforce the law *as if they were in the military*.

(A: *The author then goes on to say...*)

Perhaps most disturbing was Kraska's finding that these paramilitary police teams and aggressive tactics were increasingly being used even for regular patrols. By 1997 20% of the departments he surveyed used SWAT teams or similar units for patrol, mostly in poor high-crime areas. This was an increase of 257% since 1989. SWAT proponents argue that all of this buildup was in response to a real problem. After all, violent crime had soared in the 1980s and the early 1990s, but the SWAT teams weren't generally responding to violent crime, they were usually serving drug warrants.

When Kraska and colleague Louis Kubillis compared changes in violent crime rates to changes in the US SWAT teams in the jurisdictions they surveyed, they found that only 6.63% of the rise of SWAT deployments could be explained by the rising crime rate.

(A: *What they've done, really, is criminalized a lot of, and changed their procedures, in order to USE the SWAT teams. You understand? If you create*

SWAT teams... I don't care what kind of bureaucracy or government officialdom it is, if you create it, it will always expand its powers to justify its existence. That's the nature of technique, and technique is through every bureaucracy and governmental department there happens to be. They never start and finish where they were supposed to start, or finish, for that matter. They continue, they grow, they expand their powers, to show how they're important. Once they're on the gravy train and more cash is getting thrown at them, and lots of high salaries getting paid at the top, etc., they must then have to justify their positions by making themselves appear more necessary. You see. Now, back then, it says this about Kraska's findings from his investigation...)

His findings prompted a surge of media interest in the phenomenon of police militarization. The New York Times, The Washington Post, The Boston Globe, The National Journal and ABC News all covered Kraska's study and also ran their own investigation into the issue. But nothing really changed. Politicians and policymakers didn't even seem to notice, or if they did they didn't much care. (A: *Actually what it is, is that they've all been given the word from the top that this is the way it's to be. That's how things really work, folks, if you think that politicians are really independent and so on. There's a lot more to it than that.*)

What exactly did all this media attention accomplish is not quite clear. It resulted in no fame, no money and no appreciable difference in the phenomenon itself. Of course that wasn't Kraska's fault. Congress, state legislators and other politicians either weren't paying attention or just didn't find the reports particularly troubling. (A: *As I say, the word obviously came from the top this was coming up, getting it all planned for the 21st century, folks.*)

In fact, the phenomenon only continued to pick up momentum. The year before Kraska's reports were published Congress had passed the National Defense Authorization Security Act of 1997, the biennial bill to fund the Pentagon. One provision in the bill created what is now usually called the 1033 program, named for the section of US code assigned to it. The provision established the law enforcement support program, an agency headquartered in Fort Belvoir, Virginia. Its mission was to further grease the pipeline through which hard-core military gear flows to civilian police agencies.

(A: *This goes on to talk about Kraska talking to two elite military personnel who were training cops. The cop said here, he got a chance to talk to them before the police turned up for their training. These elite members of the present Armed Forces, active members in other words, said...*

"This is going on all over, the proliferation of SWAT teams." (A: *This is the elite member of the military that's talking. One of them said...*) We serve an arrest warrant to get some crack dealer with a .38 (A: *...that's a pistol.*), with full armor, the right shit and training you can kick ass and have fun." The other trainer jumped in and he says, "Most of these guys just like to play war. (A: *...meaning the cops and so on.*) They get a rush out of search and destroy missions (A: *Now, search and destroy missions, that's the term they're using to go into the different neighborhoods in the US, search and destroy, which they use in warfare.*) instead of the bull shit they normally do." (A: *He says.*)

When the trainees arrived, all active duty cops either on a SWAT team or soon to be, Kraska described what he saw. (A: *But the thing is, they're getting a kick out of it, you see, they're getting a high. It blends in with all the movies that they're getting brainwashed with and grown up with too.*) Several had lightweight retractable combat knives strapped to their belts (A: *...just like they'll see on the movies.*). Three wore authentic army fatigue pants with T-shirts. One wore a T-shirt that carried a picture of a burning city with gunship helicopters flying overhead and the caption, Operation Ghetto Storm. Another wore a tight black T-shirt with the initials NTOA, for National Tactical Officers Association. A few of the younger officers wore Oakley wraparound sunglasses on their heads that supported either flat-tops or military-style crew-cuts. (A: *You see you're dealing with, folks, your police are now a military force.*)

(A: *Now this part here is awfully interesting because this Kraska, who is a professor remember, who studies these phenomena, he says...*)

Most interesting are Kraska's observations about his own state of mind during the training session. There's a point in his narrative where one of the trainers asked him if he wants to take a turn with an MP5. (A: *That's a little submachine gun.*)

Kraska is reluctant but after some prodding he gives the weapons a try. (A: *Remember, he's there as an observer and doing a study, you see. And I don't know if he's pacifist or what, but he says...*) "I fired at a body-size target, and just as this officer assuredly anticipated, I made all the mistakes of someone who had never fired an automatic weapon."

He took some ribbing and then was surprised to hear himself defending his masculinity to the group, of virtual strangers, by pointing out that he had grown up hunting with shotguns. Presented with a shotgun he then redeemed himself with what he called (A: *...this is Kraska, the guy who is investigating this...*) "a personally satisfying demonstration." Kraska found himself working hard to fit in. . .

(A: *You understand, I've mentioned this so much before, how this bonding process gets you militarized. It doesn't matter what you join, whatever club you join, you're now part of a GROUP, you're the IN group. It's a social phenomenon; it works with higher mammals too. The big boys know how to use this intensely, especially on young people, and how to make them conform and have them obedient to the group, until everyone outside the group is literally that, an outsider, you're one of THEM. You see. And that's what elitism is all about. But it says here, so here is Kraska, finding it happened to him. He's observing himself as he's doing this. So he showed off with a shotgun in front of them, defended his masculinity by the jokes that come along with it, you see. And he found himself working hard to fit in, in this training session...*) . . .and win the approval of the officers, even though he was there as an observer and likely would never see them again. (A: *But here's the part...*) He also felt a rush of power. (A: *...awfully important, this. And this is what he said about that...*)

"I had an intense sense of operating on the boundary of legitimate and

illegitimate behavior. Clearly much of the activity itself was illegal, although reporting it would never have resulted in it being defined as criminal. I felt at ease and in some ways defiant. (A: *...you get that power rush.*) I've had this experience in the past when field researching police officers, and I realized that in a sense I am basking in the security of my temporary status, as a beneficiary of state-sanctioned use of force. This is likely the same intoxicating feeling of autonomy, from the law, that is experienced by an abusive police officer. On a personal level what disturbs me most was how I as a person who had so thoroughly thought-out militarism could have so easily enjoyed experiencing it. This study illustrates the expansive and seductive powers of a deeply embedded ideology of violence."

Now, this book goes through various presidents and how they keep adding more and more to this militarization program of the police, domestic police, by giving new bills out there and so on for their war on drugs, etc. etc. It's now the norm. Remember too, that this all, interestingly enough, coincided, being set up years ago in preparation for what would become during Nixon's time, as the threat of internal rebellion, for instance, when he started up FEMA, etc. But since then, the long-term planning that I see in all of this is incredible, long before 9/11 ever came along, *in preparation for 9/11*, in order... How else could you get the whole agenda for the 21st century through? Massive agenda, with all social aspects changed, and social behavior, everything, the way you view everything, change for everybody, in every aspect, even the earnings and so on, what you're here for, and down to wellness supplanting your own personal financial income, how well do you feel? *Well I'm sleeping on the streets but my wellness is pretty good, doctor.* Austerity, all of these things, you see, you could never ram it all through without lots of preparation, mentally, on the people, indoctrination, massive environment thing, *well there's too many of you all breathing out CO2, eating meat*, blah-blah-blah, and all the usual things they've been going on with since the days of HG Wells and the Fabian Society. It's an ongoing program. But again too, you have to get internal mechanisms in for this total control as well, and training a people to simply obey, obey, obey and be very afraid and obey or we'll kill you. Because a lot of people have that mentality now in the States, they're terrified of the cops.

Now, I've mentioned before too, they wanted a military mindset for a generation to grow up to become either soldiers, for perpetual war, which we're in today and we've been in for a long time now, by giving them the video games that were specifically designed - and I've done programs, go into the archives section at cuttingthroughthematrix.com and you'll find talks I've given about these programs. I said it long ago, to militarize the mindset of children, and dehumanize them to an extent, and dehumanize the figures on the screen that would be the enemy; there's always the enemy in all these games. But these games were designed by the military; I've read the articles from the mainstream and from even the manufacturers of the games, and the incredibly ongoing studies that survey the people who are growing up with these games and how they view life and how they are desensitized to *killing*. You see, they're desensitized to that. You combine that with the countless movies on, oh there's terrorists within, here comes *the one*, whoever *the one* happens to be for the movie, that can deal with it all and kill all the bad guys. And the youngsters want to be on board with the winners. The winners are those with the black outfits who have government authority, and no one gives bullshit to the winners, you see, they're tough guys. Even if they're little wimps in reality, they're now tough guys with that outfit on, carrying the big stick

which is now the big machine gun.

And that's a sad state of affairs, but it was done deliberately because they also needed the same mindset to go straight into the military. And it fitted perfectly well from Gulf War One into the invasion of Iraq; that was a whole generation on the video games, already preconditioned and desensitized to killing. As we've seen from different clips that have come out from gunships shooting down from a distance, where even the victims can't even see the gunship, and blowing up and shooting up reporters and everything else. And the language they're using is language they would use out of playing a videogame, when they're killing *real* people.

As I say, this book goes through programs like C.O.P.S. put out by Clinton when he was in. It says...

The Congress readily makes federal funding contingent on states passing a particular law or policy, think speed limits or drunk driving laws tied to federal highway funding. (A: *...and that's what you think it goes for, right?*) It's much more difficult to have a Police Department who puts a big federal grant to working day-to-day operations, and so the COPS program threw billions of dollars at police departments under the pretense of hiring what they said was community policing. (A: *...basically, friendly officers and so on.*) This Little League game (A: *In other words, that's what you think, oh there would be cops at Little League games, just a friendly cop.*) and many police agencies were actually using the money they were given to militarize. (A: *That was always the agenda, obviously, because they can't do it without permission from the top, to militarize, under the guise of putting out friendly cops on the street. The money was going to militarize.*)

One of the first to notice what was going on in Portland was Portland journalist Paul Richmond. "The unfortunate truth about community policing, as is currently being implemented, is that it's anything but community-based," he wrote in 1997 in an article for an alternative newspaper, PDXS. Instead he wrote in Portland, "The grants have resulted in increased militarization of the police force." Richmond also found in Portland that ironically, or perhaps not, a federal program touted as a way to encourage local police to get more involved with local communities was actually federalizing local law enforcement. (A: *That's the important part of it too.*)

At the same time Clinton was pushing COPS, the administration and Democrats in the Congress were pushing policies like troops-to-cops bills, and management training programs for police agencies based on federal models of policing, and a bill that would allow local police departments to fund community policing programs with asset forfeiture, money obtained through the Justice Department's equitable sharing program, (A: *That's what they call it when they steal folk's money.*) the program that allows local police departments to ignore state forfeiture laws by teaming up with the federal government. (A: *It's fascinating what really is a form of corruption going on. But really, what is corrupt when the government can do it, and they make it simply legal for them to do, by passing certain laws with nice fancy passive sounding names, isn't it?*)

Richmond found that while the overall cops-to-citizen ratio fell in the early

1990s, in Portland between 1989 and 1994 the number of officers in the city's tactical operations department jumped from 2 to 56. The two officers in charge of the city's tactical teams had formerly been in charge of the city's Department of community policing. Richmond also obtained a copy of the city's community policing strategic plan passed by the city around 1994. Among the plan's objectives was to increase the Police Department's involvement with the federal ATF and the Oregon National Guard. It included implementing at a local level Clinton's one-strike-and-you're-out plan for drug use in public housing which allowed for raids on public housing tenants, followed by their possible eviction, based on no more than an anonymous tip.

Richmond was alarmed that so many progressives in the city were embracing the community policing plan based on little more than its pleasant sounding name, and that it was coming from a Democratic administration in Washington, and administered by a progressive city government. The devil was in the details and no one had bothered to look at the details. *(A: Well it isn't just that you don't bother to look, you won't know, unfortunately, a lot of folk who did look, until you see what they've said as opposed to what you actually witness yourselves, when you see the SWAT teams on the streets and things like that with the various armored vehicles and heavy-duty military gear, etc. That's the thing, it's done by deception, and you'll find that most of these darn things always are. That's the way it really works in real life, folks.)*

I really have done a lot of study as to why people keep voting. As I say too, the other night I heard a guy talking about the surveys on why people make decisions and have their beliefs, and will believe in them till they die, regardless of all subsequent evidence that's come out in their lifetime to the contrary of what they're actually believing. They'll always vote *this* way or *vote* that way, *always*. And strangely enough, what's really interesting, one of the definitions of madness is doing the same thing over and over again expecting a different result. Exactly the same thing... It's like trying to add the same sequence of numbers up expecting a different result. But they keep doing it, and keep voting, because they've always done it that way. And they'll vote for the same party over and over, with its usual promises of some kind of future utopia, whatever it happens to be, that never happens to materialize. It's quite interesting.

Politics is just a game of deception and the deception is to keep the people so passive, as you watch a whole way of life that you're used to, which wasn't natural to begin with, believe you me. The same dominant minority in every era literally shapes your belief systems and your behavior to suit themselves at the top and when they change that behavior and *authorize* the change of behavior and *promote* that change of behavior, you've got to ask why. As I say, I can remember when I was young watching the BBC, which was all you could get at that time, promoting all these supposed rock stars and they were having interviews on the television. Remember, everybody at the BBC at that time, *everybody* there, had worked at Eton, you had to work at Eton to get into it. It's part of government. It was involved with MI-5, all the rest of it, still is to this day that way, MI-5 and so on, a big propaganda department. Adam Curtis has already said in one of his talks, his very good documentaries, that they gave the people the culture of, say, the 50s and 60s, and before that, the culture that they wanted the people to have and the behavior. But then they changed it for the 60s and then they promoted it. As I say, I can remember the guys falling off seats being interviewed, these

supposed stars that suddenly came on the scene, literally falling, and the interviewer in his Oxford accent and his *tee-hee-hee, aren't we naughty* kind of deal. And that's what was pushed out for the youngsters to idolize and copy. That wasn't a mistake, folks.

Nothing is a mistake in the culture industry. The promotion of drugs was done from the top, completely the top, in the US, and through movies and TV and all the rest of it, as being awfully cool. We also know during the Clinton time there was big scandals about the drugs coming in from Latin America to Mena, Arkansas. The CIA involvement came out. We know that drugs-for-guns scandal with Colonel Oliver North, that came out and little bits were allowed to be broadcast from the Congressional hearings. It's incredible, where it's been authorized to be sold on the American streets, to get money for another operation that the Pentagon is up to, to youngsters in the streets, and here you have at the same time the rise of the SWAT teams to supposedly combat it. Who's the bad guy? The guy who's smoking a joint somewhere. Meanwhile as I say, the drugs-for-guns scandal (or guns-for-drugs scandal) was bringing in cocaine and heroin to be sold to the youth throughout the US, and no doubt some of it would get to Canada as well, by... Special Forces were involved, the CIA, the Pentagon and all the rest, for goodness sake.

This isn't a conspiracy theory, it was FACT, folks, and it had come out during the Congressional hearings. But it was for a good cause, you understand, because they needed to get these guns to somebody else for another uprising. I mean, you understand, there's a bigger game here. Because those at the very top are not stupid if they're bringing in the drugs, and to sell on the streets, to get cash for operations, and at the same time promoting your tax money to supposedly fight the drugs by you, and militarizing the police at the same time. This falls into a big long-term goal, folks, and you're living in the days of the grand finale of this goal obviously, under the war on terror.

War on drugs, war on this, war on that, war on terror... all these supposed wars. Government cannot have internal wars on *anything*. That's the bottom line. But you take it so *casually*, the war on smoking, get it normalized, get it normalized in your vocabulary and your thought process and so on. And then you bring it into war on this, until it's simply war on crime. And then what happens with crime, they keep adding new dimensions and reevaluating what is criminal and what is not criminal, etc. etc. And if this goes on you know where it will lead to eventually. You're in the Stasi system right now, where the police and everybody's combined now, eavesdropping on everything you do and say, and twitter, and think, etc. They know your opinions on everything. They've got you all filed and categorized, your personality profile, *everything* about you, updated all the time.

Do you remember the war for freedom? The freedom war for Iraq? The Iraqi Freedom war they called it, when they *invaded* Iraq? Iraqi freedom... Everything is Orwellian doublespeak, folks, with pleasant, we like names like *freedom*. It's better than Iraqi *invasion*, isn't it? So you think you're living in reality? Do you really, really want to persist in believing you're living in reality? And you think because they give you a computer, that they can monitor everything you do on it, you can fight it *with* the computer? Do you really believe that, folks?

Remember, I've gone into the history of the military using the computer long before they gave it to you. They had discussions for years about giving it to you,

not because they'd eventually have to, but because they *wanted* you to *have* the darned thing. How else could they have total surveillance on *everybody*? Hmm? And I've gone through the psychological testing they've done on you all. They understand you forwards, backwards, upside down, you name it. They know you completely. Rockefeller and many others have said the same thing, THEY DON'T HAVE TO FORCE SOMETHING ON YOU, THEY CAN MAKE YOU GIVE UP ALL YOUR RIGHTS BECAUSE THERE ARE CERTAIN BENEFITS YOU CAN GET... *Oh it's so easy, it's so easy, yeah I can do this and it's so easy, it's better than doing this, or that, or using money, I can swipe my phone, it's so easy.*

If that's the case it's goodbye humanity as we know it, all getting ready for the next phase, you know, where the so-called millennialists will come in with the Millennium Project, which is Agenda 21, and your life is going to be ordered from birth to death *IF* they decide that you should be born in the first place, or your parents should mate, or even be parents, just mate with this person, authorized mating for procreation.

Well, sorry to harp on, folks, but as I say I've been dealing with junkers. And by the way, junk, but I don't mean drugs, I'm talking about vehicles, *old darned vehicles*, things like that. And I don't get peace to do much, much else these days, everything is a real struggle, incredible struggle and I couldn't even begin to tell you what I have to do here. I couldn't even begin, it's that bad.

Anyway I hope you get something out of this and this book is well worth getting a hold of. As I say, I don't get any money for promoting any book whatsoever. But the history in this book and the statistics and all the studies that he's done, and quoting other official surveys and so on, is just astonishing. There is one thing that I should mention too, as part of these bills, and I've read the articles years ago on the air, they had put so much money into trying to recruit directly from guys coming out of the military into police forces, so you already have them battlefield ready basically. This is what you have today. It's quite something, folks. And even the picture cover on this book is something, **Rise of the Warrior Cop: The Militarization of America's Police Forces**. It's like looking at... And I knew, by the way, and I made a reference to this at the time, it's exactly like something out of **Star Wars**, where you see these faceless *humanoids* basically, and one was white and one I think was another color; and they're the good guys and there's the bad guys, and they've got all this body armor all over them. The reason that they're faceless is because they are not individuals; that's the impression. See, when you're uniform, you're uni-form, you're not singular; the personal identity is gone. It's a *force*, you see, it's coming at you like a horde of viruses or bacterium or whatever. That's the impression, to terrify you.

And that's what has been brought on deliberately. It doesn't happen by happenstance. It doesn't happen by individual departments saying we want more cash to do this, we want to be like the guys on TV and in the movies. It's not just that. It's that it all comes from the top, folks, because they have big agendas, *always* have big agendas, and that's the nature of the beast. We're on one agenda and it encompasses many, many, many aspects, in fact, *all* aspects of your life, your thought and your behavior, even down to your personal opinions, it's all given to you, folks.

So from Hamish and myself in Ontario, Canada - which is about the only day it hasn't rained since the snow melted - it's good night and may your God or your

gods go with you.

For more information please visit the web sites:
cuttingthroughthematrix.com and alanwattsentientsentinel.eu

Alan's Materials Available for Purchase and Ordering Information:

- BOOKS** "Cutting Through" & "Waiting for the Miracle....."
Volumes 1, 2, 3 Also available in Spanish or Portuguese translation:
"Esperando el Milagro....." ([Español](#)) & "Esperando
um Milagre....." ([Português](#))
- CDs** Ancient Religions
and History MP3
CDs: & Blurbs and 'Cutting Through the Matrix'
Part 1 (1998) and Shows on MP3 CDs (Up to 50 Hours per Disc)
Part 2 (1998-2000)
- DVDs** "Reality Check Part 1" & "Reality Check Part 2 - Wisdom,
Esoterica and ...TIME"